HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 21 Saturday, May 25, 1957 Washington 6, D. C.

Printed in Two Sections

THE LIBRARY
STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

Financial Crisis: Amid the alarums and excursions of "appeals to the nation" and "slashing cuts of the Budget," leaders in Washington in the past 48 hours have been groping for something — a stabilizing formula, or an attractive slogan, or (preferably) a man who can bring sanity to what is rapidly turning into a political and financial (but particularly financial) nightmare.

For reasons which will be made clear below, "Budget cutting" alone cannot dispel the financial headache. So, not only on Capitol Hill, but also at Broad and Wall, many perplexed and important individuals look to a man for a solution.

Two statements highlight the investigation of HUMAN EVENTS into this extraordinary situation:

(1) Representative Hiestand (R.-Calif.), a forward-looking member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, told the editor of HUMAN EVENTS yesterday: "I think it most unfortunate that Mr. Humphrey should consider leaving at this particular time. There are large projects of refinancing of Federal bonds in the near future."

And he added: "I hope the President will urge Humphrey to reconsider his resignation for at least another six months."

(2) Further canvassing of the situation found E. F. Hutton, investment banker and one of the leaders of the country's financial community, thinking along similar lines. "I do hope," he remarked, "that President Eisenhower will request Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey to remain in office for some time to come. It would be a tragedy if he were to leave today. I believe it is better not to 'change saddles in midstream.' Humphrey has a moral obligation to stay in the Treasury post." Other soundings in Wall Street brought like reactions.

Now, the reason for the concern of these gentlemen can be traced to what happened two weeks ago when the Treasury tried to refinance about $5 billion in Government notes, offering a higher rate of interest than had been paid by the Government for such securities in many years. Approximately 28 per cent of the issue found no takers in the money market. "Attrition" was the euphemism used by the Government to explain this failure.

"Flight from the dollar" — so it was termed by Wall Street realists who recognized the inflationary character of Ike's policy and who proceeded to give the stock market another upward inflationary twirl.

Since that warning incident a fortnight ago, responsible leaders in Congress and business leaders have been dolefully considering the next challenge of the market, which will take place August 1, when some $16 billion of Government securities will have to be paid off or refinanced. If the test two weeks ago brought 28 per cent "attrition" on a $5 billion offering, what will happen in August when an offering of over three times as large must be made? The credit of the United States will be at stake, and inflation — not creeping but galloping inflation — will loom around the corner.

The financial nightmare is not relieved by the fact that by August 1 both Humphrey and Under Secretary Burgess will be out of office, and presumably Robert B. Anderson or some other "green hand" will have taken over the Treasury. Even if Anderson is a financial genius, he lacks the know-how in dealing with such matters which Humphrey and Burgess possess, and the task is formidable.

Finally, cutting the Budget, while helpful, cannot immediately solve the inflationary problem. If Congress cuts the Budget drastically, what will be cut will be appropriations for the next fiscal year. Meanwhile, the Administration has about $70 billion of previously authorized funds to spend, and there is no guarantee that the Administration will not increase actual spending next fiscal year. Only a Secretary with the prestige, within the Executive arm, of Humphrey could hold a rein on such spending.

Hence, leaders of Congress — while determined to cut the Budget authorizations, thereby insuring reduced spending in coming years — look for immediate relief from the inflationary trend of the Administration to the retention of the one man in whom an economy-conscious nation and its representatives in Washington have confidence — George Humphrey.

It is rumored in the House that some members plan a round-robin letter to the President demanding that he draft Humphrey "for the duration."

Heat Is On: Those who are familiar with the signs and portents of the publication world say that "the heat has been put on" by the White House to insure a more favorable reaction to the two speeches. The first Presidential TV address was a flat failure; it is too soon, as we go to press, to assess reports on public reaction to the second. But it is believed that tremendous efforts have been made in the past week to erase or modify the negative effects of the first speech. Pressure on weak-kneed legislators, on impressionable publishers, on commentators and columnists and perhaps advertisers has — it is thought — been sharply stepped up.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course, it should also be reported that a contrary drive — against the high Budget demands of the President — has been launched. On Monday, May 20, some 40 organizations — led by the American Farm Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers — met in an enthusiastic "economy" rally in Chicago and were addressed by Republican Senator Bridges and Democratic Senator Byrd. A distinctly bipartisan note was struck in most of the speeches and speakers directed fire not only at President Eisenhower, but also at Budget Director Brundage. Senator Bridges, queried by reporters, conceded that his presence as speaker at the "protest against the Budget" meeting dramatized a "serious break" between him and President Eisenhower (according to the Chicago *Tribune*, May 21). Bridges pointed out that he had been in the Senate longer than any other Republican. "When my convictions differ with the President, I must take the stand of my convictions."

Budget Battle: Washington analysts grant that the President's second TV address on the Budget — reportedly written by former ace speech-writer Emmet Hughes — was a much abler presentation than that of last week. (The first TV appeal, it is noted, had a "reverse English" effect on Congress: the House Appropriations Committee responded to the broadcast by recommending a $2.5 billion cut in the Defense budget.) Early reactions from the country will be closely studied.

Meanwhile, however, these analysts found themselves sorting the same threadbare arguments that have been advanced for foreign aid ever since "Lend Lease" was a gleam in Roosevelt's eye.

The major points that Eisenhower brought up, together with the comments most frequently heard among legislators and members of the press corps:

● The President asserted that our aid has established strong armed forces in "friendly" nations. Many of these countries, he added, "if thrown back completely on their own resources, would have to cut their armed forces."

To test the accuracy of this contention, critics of foreign aid cite the case of Great Britain — generally considered our chief ally and also the chief recipient of our aid. Through 1956, Britain had received a total of $7 billion in foreign aid — the largest sum that we have bestowed on any country. The result of this vast expenditure was a British White Paper, issued April 4, 1957. The British Government announced that, by the end of 1962, British armed forces would be reduced to 375,000 men; that conscription would be abolished by 1960; that British garrisons around the world would be sharply reduced or wholly withdrawn; that the British defense budget would be slashed by $785 million.

● Ike referred to the recipients of our aid as "friendly" nations, bound together in a system of "collective defense" against communism. Analysis of a score of the principal beneficiaries of our postwar aid (as compiled by HUMAN EVENTS from Government figures; see issue of December 8, 1956), however, reveals quite another picture. According to students of foreign affairs, only six of these countries — Free China, South Korea, South Vietnam, the Philippines, Turkey and Pakistan — have shown themselves to be consistently anti-Communist and friendly to the United States. Two are unabashedly pro-Soviet (Yugoslavia and India). Eleven are neutral or tottering on the brink of neutralism (Germany, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Greece, Laos, Cambodia, Austria, Brazil). Three are "allies" with whom our own policies have thrown us into conflict, and whom we have condemned in the United Nations (Britain, France, Israel).

● The President declared that our aid was intended "to help . . . less advanced countries grow in the strength that can sustain freedom as their way of life." Yet it is almost uniformly the case that our aid subsidizes government intervention in the economies of the "assisted" nations. This, say economists, is why our $7 billion to England and $6 billion to France have been almost completely wasted. By underwriting socialism and interventionism in these countries, we have prevented them from turning to a free economy — the only course that can produce economic "strength." Similarly, we are now subsidizing disastrous, Marxist five-year plans in India.

● Finally, Ike did not mention the key point which has rendered our foreign aid programs futile, and often harmful: the fact that the bureaucrats who administer the aid and formulate the policies have consistently shown that they have no idea of whom to aid, or when. For example, much-needed assistance was withheld from Nationalist China in the late 1940's; pro-Communist India has received roughly three times as much aid as anti-Communist Pakistan; we have lavished an undetermined amount of money on the Communist "Trojan horse," Marshal Tito (and are now resuming our program of grants to him), but did nothing to assist the anti-Communist revolution in Hungary.

Many in the Capital feel that Senator Knowland summed up the absurdity of our policies in a speech delivered the day after Eisenhower's TV address. Knowland cited Nationalist China, South Korea, South Vietnam, Pakistan, Turkey, Thailand, and the Philippines as the nations to whom we should give jet fighter planes, rather than Yugoslavia's Tito — who will receive 75 American jets this year.

Until the Administration can use our dollars in a common-sense manner, it is observed, Congress should slash foreign aid funds to the bone.

Congressional Economy: Economy does not begin at home, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Although the appropriation it passed this week for Congressional operations was below Budget estimates,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it nevertheless does provide funds for a Capitol Hill beautification and improvement program which altogether is expected to cost some $200 million, perhaps more.

It includes about $25 million for the new Senate Office Building, well over half finished and slated for occupancy early next year.

But the phase of the program to which many sincerely economical House members object most vigorously is for a third House Office Building, which, with side appurtenances and trimmings, will cost at least $100 million.

The trimmings include purchase, by condemnation, of the 150-room Congressional Hotel, just across the street from the existing House Office Buildings, for use as office space for Representatives while their present office building quarters are being remodeled. Everybody tries to avoid the question, but guesses are that the Hotel, only nine years old now, will be torn down and its site made into a park when the renovation work is completed. Condemnation cost: something over $1.5 million.

The third House Office Building, for which excavation work has almost been completed, is estimated to cost $64 million and will make it possible for each member to have at least three rooms in his office suite instead of the present two rooms. Relatively few members honestly need the third room.

The over-all project includes a multimillion dollar garage for members, and a $9.5 million cafeteria building to serve members and their staffs.

Representative H. R. Gross of Iowa proposed eliminating funds for this project and leaving the excavation as a monument to economy. The vote: 132 to 73 against him.

Politics: Despite the descent in public popularity of the President (see latest Gallup Poll) and his inability to rouse the public by his TV appearances, the Democratic leaders are — paradoxically — not happy. Their rejoicing about the internecine fighting within the GOP is impaired by contemplation of how badly the Democrats are split. While even Douglas, recognizing popular sentiment, joins the "cut-the-Budget" parade, the "intellectuals" (see Leon Keyserling and the ADA) support Ike on the Budget or go even further in spending proposals.

Shrewd heads among the Democratic politicos are terrified at the progress made by Senator Knowland in the GOP political scene, as they actually fear him as a candidate in '60 more than Nixon. Information reaching HUMAN EVENTS from Democratic sources reports belief among Democrats — both liberal and conservative — that if the Republicans met in convention next week, they would nominate Knowland.

While their friends, the "liberal" commentators and columnists, talk scornfully about the "Old Guard" and the "dinosaur wing" of the Republicans, the Democratic politicos do not similarly fool themselves. They know that the right wing of the party is enriched by *young* men — like Knowland (49), Goldwater (48), Jenner (49). They realize that "conservatism is on the march" in America today and that these men are riding "the wave of the future." "Young" Republicans like Knowland, the Democratic leaders dimly realize, are the ones with the "new ideas," and the "liberal" Democrats have nothing to offer but the faded phrases of the New and Fair Deal.

But most of all they are painfully conscious of the fact that the Democrats have not one single leader to grab off the popularity which Ike is losing. They realize that the public has no use for Stevenson, Truman or Harriman (and they privately wish to heaven those "face cards" would shut up). Leader, Soapy Williams, Furcolo have not caught on. And they do not take too seriously young "crewcut" Kennedy. He just fills in until the leaders find someone who can inspire public confidence. It is hard to see, with such prospects, how the Democrats can capitalize on differences within the GOP.

Status of Forces: The long-smoldering dispute over America's "Status of Forces" agreements exploded last week in the faces of the Washington bureaucracy. Since the inception of these agreements, giving foreign courts jurisdiction over American servicemen overseas, the bureaucrats have calmly assured Congress that there was no danger in them. Now bureaucratic complacency, at least for the time being, has vanished.

The explosion came with the case of Specialist 3/c William S. Girard, a soldier stationed in Japan. It is alleged that, while on duty at a firing range, Girard fatally injured a Japanese woman. Subsequently, Rear Admiral Miles H. Hubbard, a member of the Joint Japanese-American Committee on matters of jurisdiction, yielded the legal right to try Girard to the Japanese authorities. His decision produced an uproar in Washington.

It is now recalled that Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy, testifying July 19, 1955, flatly told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that, under the "Status of Forces" agreements, "United States servicemen remain under United States jurisdiction with respect to offenses commited while on duty." And it is pointed out that the 1953 protocol signed by the United States and Japan provides that American military authorities retain jurisdiction over their personnel with regard to "offenses arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official duty." Yet, Admiral Hubbard, reportedly acting on the advice of "legal experts," yielded jurisdiction.

Who, Washington asks, are the "legal experts"? Nobody wants to take the responsibility. The Department of Defense, it is said, has been circulating an "unofficial" explanation claiming that the "experts" were representatives of the State Department, who advised Hubbard to turn the soldier over to the Japanese. State vigorously denies this, protesting that its advice was never asked and never given. In the mean-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, Secretary of Defense Wilson has suspended all official comment while the case is "reviewed," and the State Department has instructed American Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II to confer with the Japanese and to forward his recommendations to Washington. Girard, at this writing, is still in physical custody of United States authorities.

It is doubted, on the Hill, whether the United States will see its way clear to regaining jurisdiction over Girard; it is believed that the pressure is on to sacrifice the soldier as a sop to anti-American sentiment in Japan. But even if American rights, in this instance, cannot be preserved, incensed legislators are resolved that this kind of thing should never happen again. The Girard case is fueling a renewed attack on the whole network of "Status of Forces" agreements (we have them with over 50 countries), which have long been under fire. Several Congressmen, Senators, and patriotic organizations have never ceased in their efforts to have them amended (see HUMAN EVENTS for May 18, 1957).

In the forefront of Congressional opponents to the agreements is Representative Frank Bow (R.-O.); this session Bow has introduced H. J. Res. 16, which seeks, by amending the major (NATO) "Status of Forces" treaty, to restore to American citizens the protections of our Constitution. The companion bill in the Senate, S. J. Res. 40, is sponsored by Senator Jenner. It is hoped that the outcry over the Girard case will prod Congress into initiating the necessary revisions.

Atom Treaty: A warning passed along to HUMAN EVENTS by well-informed sources: don't take at face value the news stories saying that the "Atoms for Peace" Treaty is "virtually assured" of approval. True, high-level pressure for it is dangerous. But the infighting has just begun. Strong grassroots opposition can persuade crucial Senators that they should not vote for ratification (see HUMAN EVENTS for May 18, 1957).

Stillbirth of a Front: The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee this week performed the highly creditable feat of blowing the whistle on a promising Communist front organization just nine days after it was born.

It was something called the American Forum for Socialist Education, creation of which was announced on May 12 in a press release issued by A. J. Muste, well-known veteran of many previous fronts.

Its objective was described as promotion of "study and serious untrammeled political discussions among all elements that think of themselves as related to historic socialist and labor traditions, values and objectives. . . ." Its appearance was hailed with a front-page laudatory story in the official Communist *Daily Worker*, and a next-day editorial likewise praising the Forum.

The *Daily Worker* noted that, of its 40-member National Committee, two "are leading members of the Communist party, Doxey Wilkerson and Albert Blumberg." It made no mention of several other Committee members who, like Muste, have been associated with numerous other front set-ups.

This week, the Internal Security Subcommittee put Blumberg on the witness stand where he refused to answer any questions except to give his name and address.

Among the queries of Subcommittee counsel Robert Morris which he refused to answer were:

1. Whether the Forum had its origin in a report to the Communist Party's National Committee in April, 1956, suggesting a union of Communists, Trotskyites and like-minded thinkers.

2. Whether an original memorandum by Muste on how such a group should be set up, was rejected by the Reds as "too anti-Soviet," and whether he subsequently wrote another memorandum which led to creation of the Forum.

Acting Chairman John M. Butler of Maryland urged action by the Justice Department to label the Forum formally as a Communist organization.

Book Event: *Labor Union Monopoly: A Clear and Present Danger*, by Donald Richberg; Henry Regnery Company; Chicago. $3.50.

The origin of this publishing event has interest. Over three years ago, Henry Regnery foresaw the crisis in labor's ranks which is just now reaching the stage of Congressional investigation. He went forth to find a writer who would deal with labor problems frankly and critically, with no New Deal inhibitions. For over a year he failed to discover a scribe who would dare to undertake the task; some were downright afraid, others who covered labor for newspapers did not feel that they could write with entire freedom. Finally, the publisher persuaded Donald Richberg, a very busy and courageous lawyer, to spare some time to embody his views and experience in book form.

Richberg certainly has the experience, and no literary labor goon can deny his early allegiance to the cause of protection of the laboring man's rights. He took part in the struggles of 30 years ago to unionize industry, and he co-authored the famous Railway Labor Act of 1926.

Richberg's disillusionment with the American labor movement began in the Thirties, when he perceived the development of the radical influence of the CIO and the growing political power of organized labor.

Essentially a product of the era when trust-busting and anti-monopoly were in the forefront of the news, the author quite logically comes to the conclusion that the "clear and present danger" arises from the monopoly position which organized labor has attained. And he directs his most devastating fire at "compulsory unionism," which he terms "the new slavery." He offers a well-reasoned defense of the "right-to-work" laws.

In his final chapter, Richberg goes right to the heart of the situation today, when he says: "What is most needed at the present time is not the drafting of a lot of laws that will curb the economic and physical violence of labor union activities. What is most needed, and first needed, is an education of the so-called intellectual stratum of American life to a clear-eyed comprehension of the grave menace to our free economy and our free government in the unchecked growth and continuous spread of labor union monopolies."

This book is the most readable, authoritative and constructive description available of the labor situation of today.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

Letter from WERNER JANSSEN, Symphony Conductor: "I find that HUMAN EVENTS offers a remarkable insight into the various forces of our political scene and helps me to a better understanding of it."

Copies of the blistering book which has done so much to reduce appropriations for USIA and foreign aid, *The Great Giveaway* by Eugene W. Castle, may be obtained from HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., $3.50 postpaid.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 21 HUMAN EVENTS May 25, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

CONGRESS AT THE CROSSROADS

Budget Fight A Struggle Against Executive Encroachment

By FRANK CHODOROV

THE YEAR WAS 1942. The President was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"Mr. President," said the Congressman, "I'm sorry to disagree with you, but I don't think this bill should be enacted into law, and I will vote against it."

"You will regret it," said the President.

Both the President and the Congressman were Democrats, and the district had long been considered a safe one for their party. Yet the Congressman who voted against the bill was defeated at the next election. Did the President's threat have anything to do with the defeat? Who knows? In such cases you can only surmise, never prove.

In 1953 there was the case of the Senator who was an avowed and committed supporter of the Bricker Amendment, long before the Administration had come out against it. Now he was coming up for reelection. The strong labor organization in his state sided with the Administration on this issue and had put up a candidate of its own. Perhaps that was why at the last moment, and to everybody's surprise, the Senator voted against the bill. Nevertheless, he was beaten at the polls. After a decent interval, the President appointed him to a well-paying job. Was this the "pay-off"? Perish the thought.

Cynical Washington likes to enliven its cocktail parties with such stories, but the cognoscenti do not draw any moral precepts from them. Politics, they know, is the art of the expedient, and whatever succeeds is sound, in ethics, economics or statesmanship. Only the neophyte applies absolutes to political practices.

AND SO, WHEN a number of Republican Congressmen lined themselves up against the President's Budget (which has become a bad word), this commentator interviewed a few of the rebels to find out about the politics of their revolt. The papers had been saying that the President had lost his control over Congress, or the Republican part of it, because, due to the two-term limitation, he could not offer them his coattails in the 1960 election. This the Congressmen dismissed as editorial poppycock. His coattails, of questionable value anyway, had nothing to do with the opposition. Then, what?

Somebody whose voice had greater potency than the President's had spoken to Congress. And that voice, shouting through the megaphone of a million letters and telegrams, told them that unless that Budget was materially cut these Congressmen need not expect to be returned at the next election. As against that dictate, nothing the President (which is the bureaucracy) could do for or against them in the remaining three-and-a-half years could carry much weight. It is more expedient to win at the polls than to win the favor of the Administration.

That settled, the interviews drifted into the speculative: what can the President do for or to a Congressman to get him to toe the line? These Congressmen were not reluctant to tell because they were not in the good graces of the bureaucracy and had nothing to lose.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To appreciate the Presidential arts of persuasion one must bear in mind that the Legislative branch of Government, even as the Executive, consists of men, and that the virtues and shortcomings of mortals control their behavior. The bureaucracy is well aware of that fact, and when it sets out to win Congressional votes its method is to ascertain the point of each Congressman's vulnerability. He must be treated as a man. There are always some Congressmen, as the bureaucracy well knows, who are beyond redemption; they want no favors, or they have complete control of their local political machines, or they are financially independent, or, what is most unusual, they are immune to "Potomac fever" — which is the urge to luxuriate in the Washington social sun. These men are not worth working on. After all, a bill is won or lost by a few votes, and the Administration need only apply its arts of persuasion to a handful to achieve its purpose.

The Achilles heel of Congress — particularly the lower House — is that it is always running for re-election. The urgency for re-election stems from various impulses, not the least of which is that for many members defeat involves something akin to tragedy.

Very few Congressmen are men of independent means. A few have farms or businesses which can be turned over to friends or relatives, but many come from law, insurance, accountancy, finance — occupations which depend on personal service. Transference of clients often means their permanent loss. Defeat at the polls, therefore, may mean starting all over again at the bottom, or near it.

To that unpleasant prospect must be added the psychological effect of defeat. It carries with it, even if the defeat stems from an exercise of moral integrity, a social stigma. To "go home" involves the ordeal of facing up to the sympathy of friends, the gloating of enemies, the isolation of the ex-champion. For that reason, among others, the ex-Congressman always thinks of hanging on in Washington, whatever the dictate of the polls; there, because he was once in the swim of things, the atmosphere is more congenial. "Potomac fever" is endemic and therefore nobody is an outcast. Hence, as a cushion against the vicissitudes of politics, back in the minds of many Congressmen of meager means is the prospect of a sinecure in the Washington bureaucracy. Other than that, if a man has served several terms and has become familiar with the bureaucratic labyrinth, he has the choice of becoming a lobbyist, a "five per center" or a Washington lawyer. One Congressman expressed the opinion that 80 per cent of the "exes" never go home. That may be an exaggeration.

At any rate, the importance of being re-elected and of standing in with the powers that be is the Congressional vulnerability which lends itself to Presidential persuasion.

THE TACTICS of persuasion are of two kinds: direct and indirect. The direct kind consists of working on a wavering or recalcitrant Congressman to get him to see the light; the indirect kind consists of inducing his constituency to bring him to his senses.

In either case, the first business of the bureaucracy is to sound out Congress on any given bill so as to pick its targets. About the time a bill is dropped into the hopper the fact will be noised about that it has the blessing or the condemnation of the Administration. There are various ways of doing this, but one that is not well-advertised should be mentioned. The bureaucracy is well-sprinkled with former Congressmen among whose duties is that of acting as spies or propagandists for the Administration. As former members they have the special privilege of sitting on the floor of the Senate or the House and of mingling with the present incumbents in the cloakrooms; thus they are strategically placed for the work they are expected to do. It is not long before every Congressman knows how the Administration stands on a given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bill, and the implication is clear that his attitude toward it will have a bearing on his standing with the bureaucracy from whom all blessings flow; and, of course, its agents report to the higher echelons of the bureaucracy the way the different Congressmen react to the bill so that the campaign of persuasion can be mapped out.

The logic of the campaign rests on the original premise that the first consideration of the Congressman is re-election. Back home there is a powerful group dead-set on getting a new Post Office building, a Government plant, a bridge, something that will bring big chunks of Federal money into the community; or the political machine expects the Congressman to place some of its henchmen on the payroll; or a heavy campaign contributor looks to him to help obtain a lucrative contract from the Government. Since such patronage helps to re-election are largely bureaucratic dispensations, a telephone call from a White House aide helps him make up his mind on the bill in question, regardless of his judgment or conscience.

Then there are personal, rather than political, points of attack. Most Congressmen, like all other people, have brothers-in-law whose talents are not appreciated in the market place and who must therefore be provided with some sort of living. The monstrous catch-all for incompetents, the bureaucracy, is never without vacancies for relatives of Congressmen whose voting records qualify them for consideration; thus a kinship with the bureaucracy is set up in Congress. The cornucopia of the ruling bureaucracy also contains such precious gems as appointments to "investigatory" junkets to all parts of the world, invitations to state or private social functions, favors in the way of airplane transportation for personal trips, information from its secret files, and so on. It pays to be in its good graces.

Nevertheless, there are obdurate Congressmen, men who are not purchasable. With these, if their votes are needed, the indirect approach must be employed. The technique is to work up a popular "demand" for the legislation he opposes. That is, to threaten him with defeat if he persists in not going along. His bailiwick is inundated with press releases and pamphlets, even books, supporting the Administration bill; local civic and sewing clubs, always in need of speakers, provide sounding boards for the bureaucracy's multitudinous agents; influential citizens are properly "briefed," sometimes invited to Washington for that purpose. There seems to be no end of money expendable for such infighting, money which the Congressman obviously is not able to match. Finally, there is the possibility that an embittered bureaucracy may encourage a rival to contest the seat of an especially pernicious Congressman; that is, the "purge" technique.

THUS, THE WATCH-DOG theory of government which prompted the Founding Fathers to set up the triumvirate system is undermined. The pressures which the bureaucracy is able to bring to bear upon Congressmen tends to make the Legislative branch a subsidiary, almost a useless, appendage of the Executive, and the concentration of power which was most feared in 1787 is well on the way toward accomplishment.

How is this being done? By money. While it is true that the power of the purse is still the prerogative of Congress, for all practical purposes the actual dispensation of the money appropriated by Congress is in the hands of the managing bureaucracy, and it is to be expected that this body should use the funds at its disposal to its own advantage and to the disadvantage of the supposedly restraining Congress. The bureaucracy consists of mortals, bent on improving their prerogatives and perquisites of office — their power — and their purpose is facilitated by the amount of money they can spend. Hence, the bigger the tax-load the people must bear, the greater the strength of the Executive, which is the bureaucracy, and the corresponding weakness of the Legislative body.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a corollary of this diminution of the importance of Congress and the increased importance of the Executive, by way of taxes, is the lowering of the area of freedom enjoyed by the people. The more money the ruling class has, the more it will intervene in the affairs of the people; it will find reason enough, if it has the money, to assume functions for which the Government has no competence and the end-all of which is only to regulate, control and manipulate the lives of the taxpayers. To put it concisely, the more of the people's money in the hands of the governing body, the less freedom.

This truth in time, sometimes too late, dawns on the masses and then a revolt is in the making. That is what America is experiencing today. The Battle of the Budget is in fact an incipient struggle of the American people to regain some of the freedom which they have lost by their acquiescence to increasing taxation. The spontaneous mail protest that inundated Congress on the announcement of Eisenhower's proposed expenditures has now turned from a demand for economy into a demand for a reduction of taxes. In their pragmatic common-sense way, the public have hit on the fact that Government will find reason enough to spend all it can lay its hands on, and that the way to contain it is first to limit its revenues; the expenditures will come tumbling after. The undertow of the Battle of the Budget is a strong revulsion of feeling toward taxes in general, the income tax in particular.

THE SIGNIFICANT RESULT of this undirected uprising is that Congress is facing up to the bureaucracy with unprecedented vigor. Keeping in mind that the urgency to be returned to office is the Congressman's primary motivation, and that the voters have the final say-so in this matter, he is now listening carefully to the voice of the people rather than to the voice of the bureaucracy. So much so that the President thought it necessary to abandon, or supplement, the usual tactics of winning Congressional votes by bribery or intimidation, and resorted to cajoling the voting public into acceptance of his spending program. Will his radio and television efforts ultimately dissuade the people from what now seems to be their fell purpose?

The answer to this question involves more than the saving of a few tax dollars. It involves the saving of Congress. It involves the restoration of the dignity and independence of that important part of our historic triumvirate. Of course, Congress will never again be what the Founding Fathers intended it to be, a bulwark against the inclination of the Executive branch to acquire more and more power, until the revenues of the latter are greatly curtailed; perhaps nothing but the repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment will do that. But if the Battle of the Budget results in a check on expenditures and a reduction of taxes, the taste of victory may impel the people, and therefore Congress, to go further.

The Battle of the Budget will be won or lost this summer, in the final weeks of the present session, when the bureaucracy, taking advantage of the weariness induced by debate and the debilitating climate of Washington, will try to push through their cherished legislation. If the mail protest continues up to the last minute, Congress will heed it.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "CONGRESS AT THE CROSSROADS"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED